UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/786,080	02/26/2004	Yasuhisa Mashiko	60188-786	3537	
	7590 10/28/200 WILL & EMERY LL	EXAMINER			
600 13TH STR			LAMB, CHRISTOPHER RAY		
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2627		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/28/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/786,080	MASHIKO, YASUHISA		
	Examiner	Art Unit		

		Officepher 1t: Earl	10	2021	
The MAILING DATE of this communicati	ion appe	ars on the cover st	neet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 October 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE	E THIS A	APPLICATION IN CO	NDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior application, applicant must timely file one of the fapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance periods:	following i e of Appe	replies: (1) an amend eal (with appeal fee)	dment, affidavi in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from t	_	•			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date no event, however, will the statutory period for replexaminer Note: If box 1 is checked, check either by	oly expire la box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS b). ONLY CHECK BOX	from the mailing	g date of the final rejectio	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPE Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the pe under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration da set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the C may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR NOTICE OF APPEAL	The date of extended of the solution of the solution.	on which the petition ur tension and the corresp shortened statutory peri than three months afte	onding amount od for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief	f in comp	liance with 37 CFR 4	11.37 must be	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must b AMENDMENTS	any exter	nsion thereof (37 CF	R 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final re  (a) They raise new issues that would require functions the issue of new matter (see No.	urther cor	nsideration and/or se			cause
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NC</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application appeal; and/or</li> </ul>		-	y materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without can NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 4	·1.33(a)).				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37			tice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.				Paral Clad an andrew	( P (b
<ul> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo non-allowable claim(s).</li> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment</li> </ul>			•	•	_
how the new or amended claims would be rejected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 3-5.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ed is prov				the second secon
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final a because applicant failed to provide a showing of was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e)</li> </ol>	good and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date entered because the affidavit or other evidence for showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is n	ailed to o	vercome <u>all</u> rejectior	ns under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An exREQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	xplanatior	n of the status of the	claims after e	ntry is below or attache	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered below.</li> </ol>	dered but	t does NOT place the	e application ir	condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Stater</i></li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	ment(s). (	(PTO/SB/08) Paper i	No(s)		
/Joseph H. Feild/					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627					

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No.

Note 11: Applicant argues that Wachi does not disclose wherein "the control information generating means includes numerical range limiting means for limiting the numerical range of the operation result value." Applicant's argument is that the operation result value is not the detected location of the optical spot, but that the operation result value is used to detect the location of the spot by looking it up in a table.

However, the claim states that the revolution number information is "based on an operation result value obtained by the division." In Wachi, the location of the optical spot is "an operation result value obtained by the division." The product of the division operation is used as an input to the ROM table and the location of the optical spot is the output: therefore the location of the spot is an operation result value obtained by the division, in that the division is used to obtain the location.

Since a stored table inherently has a limited number of entries, the range of possible outputs of the table is also inherently limited. Furthermore, since the table outputs are locations on an optical disc of a specific size, the table would not have values that are outside the size of the disc. Therefore the operation result value must be limited to a range that includes only possible locations on the disc.

Applicant refers to a specific paragraph in their specification to describe what they've intended to claim. If Applicant believes their operation result value is different than the one relied on in Wachi or that the limit circuit functions differently than the inherent limits of Wachi, they are welcome to claim these differences. However, Wachi meets the current claim language.